

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/450,185

Applicant(s)

RASMUSSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Mark E. Wallerson

Art Unit

2626

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark E. Wallerson.

(3) _____.

(2) Stephen Catlin.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6/22/2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Banker et al (U.S. 6,275,600.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

MARK WALLERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed various limitations to independent claims 1 and 12. The Examiner questioned whether there is clear support in the original specification for the limitation "...the image quality analysis module ONLY (emphasis added) identifies image quality deviations that are perceivable by the human observer: Applicant will reconsider the proposed claim language The Examiner will reconsider the cited reference and any new limitations upon receipt of Applicant's response..